

### REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 24, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 15, 35, and 38–39 are hereby amended; claim 40 has been added; and claim 2 is hereby canceled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3–40 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 33 is objected to for being incorrectly numbered. Applicants hereby amend claim 33 to be numbered as claim 35 and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

In the Office Action, claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants hereby amend claim 39 to depend from claim 38. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 39 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In the Office Action, claims 1–9, 12, 13, 15–30, 34, 35, 37, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Studt in view of Mills. By this amendment, Applicants cancel claim 2 without prejudice or disclaimer and transfer its subject matter to independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 1 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “a door frame” and “an outer window ... wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” Nothing in Studt and Mills, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner states that “glass or like transparent materials, such as plastic are commonly known to be mutable in shape and therefore engageably fit the shape of the frame, as taught by Mills.” (Office Action, p. 4). Applicants respectfully submit that even if the Examiner’s statement is true, Mills still does not teach the aforementioned features. In fact, it teaches away from this feature. Specifically, Mills teaches that “frame 18 is preferably made of a one-piece strip of metal or other flexible, bendable material which is bent into *the rectangular*

*form* shown.” (Mills, col. 2, ll. 11–13, *emphasis added*). Applicants respectfully assert that the bendable feature of the frame cited by the Examiner is for forming a rectangular shape of the frame, not for forming a “front surface curved in left/right directions” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Mills does not teach that “the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” In contrast, Mills teaches that “[t]he [glass] panels 14 and 16 are of *identical rectangular size and shape* and are in spaced *parallel planes* ... [t]he top and bottom side edges of the two panels are respectively in opposed *parallel relation* to one another, as are the right and left edges thereof.” (Col. 2, ll. 5–9, *emphasis added*). As such, Mills teaches parallel (i.e., flat) plates, which is inconsistent with an “outer window [that] is curved the same with the door frame” recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 3–9, 12, 13, 15–30, 34, 35, 37, 38, and 39, are allowable over any combination of Studt and Mills.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 38 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 38 is allowable in that it recites “a door frame,” and “an outer window ... wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” Nothing in Studt and Mills, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as those regarding claim 1 above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 38, and its dependent claim 39, are allowable over any combination of Studt and Mills.

In the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Studt and Mills, and further in view of Faccoli. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claims 10 and 11, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because Faccoli fails to cure the deficiency of Studt and Mills to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over any combination of Studt, Mills, and Faccoli.

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Studt and Mills, and further in view of Linton. Applicants respectfully

traverse the rejection of claim 14 and request reconsideration. Claim 14, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because Linton fails to cure the deficiency of Studt and Mills to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, as it depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Studt, Mills, and Linton.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 36 and request reconsideration. Claim 36, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because Linton fails to cure the deficiency of Studt and Mills to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36, as it depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Studt, Mills, and Linton.

In the Office Action, claim 31–33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Studt and Mills, and further in view of Gebhardt. Claims 31–33, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because Gebhardt fails to cure the deficiency of Studt and Mills to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31–33, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over any combination of Studt, Mills, and Gebhardt.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant